

REMARKS

In view of the above amendments and the following remarks, reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

I. Amendments to the Specification and Abstract

The specification and abstract have been reviewed and revised to improve their English grammar. The amendments to the specification and abstract have been incorporated into a substitute specification and abstract. Attached are two versions of the substitute specification and abstract, a marked-up version showing the revisions, as well as a clean version. No new matter has been added.

II. Amendments to the Claims

Claims 27 and 29 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer of the subject matter contained therein.

Further, independent claims 1, 28, 30 and 36-40 have been amended to clarify features of the invention recited therein and to further distinguish the present invention from the references relied upon in the rejections discussed below.

It is also noted that claims 1-19, 21-26, 28 and 30-40 have been amended to make a number of editorial revisions thereto. These editorial revisions have been made to place the claims in better U.S. form. Further, these editorial revisions have not been made to narrow the scope of protection of the claims, or to address issues related to patentability, and therefore, these amendments should not be construed as limiting the scope of equivalents of the claimed features

offered by the Doctrine of Equivalents.

III. 35 U.S.C. § 102 Rejection

Claims 1-21 and 28-40 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Haneda (U.S. 6,211,974). This rejection is believed clearly inapplicable to amended independent claims 1, 28, 30 and 36-40 and the claims that depend therefrom for the following reasons.

Independent claim 1 recites an apparatus for generating a video. Claim 1 recites that the apparatus includes a database unit that stores: a still picture group of a plurality of still pictures; a feature of each still picture of the picture group (the feature of each still picture being from among features identified in an expression for still pictures); a style group of a plurality of styles; a feature of each style of the style group (the feature of each style being from among features identified in an expression for styles); music group of a plurality of musical pieces; and a feature of each musical piece of the music group (the feature of each musical piece being from among features identified in an expression for music).

Further, claim 1 recites that the apparatus includes a selection unit operable to select, from only one selection group that is only one of the still picture group, the style group, and the music group, a still picture, a style, or a musical piece. In addition, claim 1 recites that the apparatus includes a feature conversion unit operable to convert the feature read out by the feature reading unit into features identified in two other expressions, from among the expression for still pictures, the expression for styles, and the expression for music, the two other expressions being expressions other than the expression including the feature read out by the

reading unit. Claim 1 also recites that the apparatus includes a determination unit operable to determine, as two other elements used to generate the video, a still picture, a musical piece, or a style from each corresponding group of two groups other than the selection group from among the still picture group, the style group, and the music group, the two other elements being determined based on the features included in the two other expressions and resulting from the conversion by the feature conversion unit. Finally, claim 1 recites that the apparatus includes a scenario generation unit operable to generate a scenario of the video, based on the selection element selected by the selection unit and the two other elements determined by the determination unit.

According to the above-identified structure required by claim 1, only one type of data is selected (i.e., claim 1 recites “select, from only one selection group that is only one of the still picture group, the style group, and the music group, as a selection element used when generating the video, a still picture, a style, or a musical piece”). Further, according to the structure required by claim 1, based on the selection of only the one type of data (the still picture, the style, or the musical piece), another type of data is determined through conversion of a feature of the selected data (i.e., claim 1 recites “convert the feature read out by the feature reading unit into features identified in two other expressions”). In addition, according to the structure required by claim 1, a scenario is generated using selected data (selected element) and the two other elements determined by the determination unit.

For example, when a user selects only one still picture from the database, the style and the musical piece corresponding to the feature of the still picture are automatically determined from the database so as to generate a scenario. This allows the user to generate a short video

very easily and casually, saving time to be spent on searching vast amounts of data (e.g., still pictures, styles, and musical pieces).

Haneda fails to disclose or suggest the above-mentioned distinguishing features and the results of the structure as recited in independent claim 1.

Rather, Haneda merely teaches that images and music can be separately selected and simultaneously played back (see col. 9, lines 1-6 and 25-43, col. 10, lines 7-23, col. 29, lines 33-66, and Fig. 31 as identified in the Office Action).

Thus, in view of the above, it is clear that Haneda teaches separately selecting images and music for simultaneous playback, but does not disclose or suggest the selection unit that selects, from only one selection group that is only one of the still picture group, the style group, and the music group, a still picture, a style, or a musical piece, and the feature conversion unit that converts a feature of the selection of the selection unit into features identified in two other expressions, from among the expression for still pictures, the expression for styles, and the expression for music, the two other expressions being expressions other than the expression including the feature of the selection by the selection unit, as required by claim 1.

In other words, although Haneda teaches separately selecting images and music for playback, Haneda fails to disclose or suggest that only one type of data is selected, that based on the selection of only the one type of data (the still picture, the style, or the musical piece), another type of data is determined through conversion of a feature of the selected data, and that a scenario is generated using the selected data (selected element) and the two other elements determined by the determination unit, as required by claim 1.

Therefore, because of the above-mentioned distinctions it is believed clear that

independent claim 1 and claims 2-26 that depend therefrom are not anticipated by Haneda.

Furthermore, in light of the discussion above, Haneda does not provide the above-mentioned result of the structure required by claim 1 because the invention of Haneda does not provide a feature that when a user selects only one still picture from the database, the style and the musical piece corresponding to the feature of the still picture are automatically determined from the database so as to generate a scenario, which allows the user to generate a short video very easily and casually, saving time to be spent on searching vast amounts of data (e.g., still pictures, styles, and musical pieces).

Furthermore, there is no disclosure or suggestion in Haneda or elsewhere in the prior art of record which would have caused a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify Haneda to obtain the invention of independent claim 1. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that independent claim 1 and claims 2-26 that depend therefrom are clearly allowable over the prior art of record.

Amended independent claims 28, 30, 36, 37, 38, 39 and 40 are directed to an apparatus, an apparatus, a system, a method, a method, a program, and a program, respectively and each recite features that correspond to the above-mentioned distinguishing features of independent claim 1. Thus, for the same reasons discussed above, it is respectfully submitted that claims 28, 30, 36, 37, 38, 39 and 40 and the claims that depend therefrom are allowable over Haneda.

IV. 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) Rejections

Regarding dependent claims 21-26, which were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Haneda and Nishikawa et al. (U.S. 2005/0158030), it

is respectfully submitted that Nishikawa does not disclose or suggest the above-discussed features of independent claim 1 which are lacking from the Haneda reference. Therefore, no obvious combination of Haneda and Nishikawa would result in, or otherwise render obvious, the invention recited independent claim 1 and claims 2-26 that depend therefrom.

V. Conclusion

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is submitted that the present application is now in condition for allowance and an early notification thereof is earnestly requested. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone to resolve any remaining issues.

Respectfully submitted,

Yasuhiro MORI et al.

/Andrew L. Dunlap/

By: 2009.03.30 10:49:22 -04'00'

Andrew L. Dunlap
Registration No. 60,554
Attorney for Applicants

ALD/led
Washington, D.C. 20005-1503
Telephone (202) 721-8200
Facsimile (202) 721-8250
March 30, 2009